



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH TO THE SENATE

THE President's speech to the Senate July 10 is a disappointment. At a time when the people of the United States are vitally concerned to know the realities with which the treaty deals, the President is wordy and abstract. At a time when we are all concerned to know the President's explanation of the disposal of Shantung, he contents himself by hinting simply at "the cross-currents of politics and of interests" in Paris, and by granting that "it was not easy to graft the new order of ideas to the old, and some of the fruits of the grafting may, I fear, for a time be bitter." It would have been more enlightening if the President had reiterated less of his Fourth of July speech and told us more of these "fruits." We cannot understand how the President could under such circumstances tell us again that we entered the war, "not because our material interests were directly threatened or because any special treaty obligations to which we were parties had been violated," and that "we entered the war as a disinterested champion of right." Everyone knows, or should know, that "material interests" played a large part in this war. Everyone knows, or should know, that "special treaties and obligations to which we were parties"—witness the sinking of unarmed merchant vessels, the rape of Belgium—did also play an effective part. It would not weaken Mr. Wilson's expression were he to recognize that we entered the war, not as a "disinterested champion of right" merely, but as an interested champion of France and Belgium and England, and of American rights on the high seas. We find it difficult to understand the President when he says, "with very few exceptions, the men who sat with us at the peace table desired as sincerely as we did to get away from the bad influences," etc., especially in light of the fact that there were only two others sitting with him at the peace table—at the most, four. After his experience with Italy and Japan, Mr. Wilson must know that "the illegitimate purposes, demoralizing ambitions," have not been and are not confined to the German empire. His presentation of his League of Nations would have been stronger had he dwelt more at length upon the purposes and ambitions against which he has contended and with which the world has now to deal.

Mr. Wilson tells us that he formulated the principles which were accepted as the basis of the peace, but he neglected to tell us how they can be said to apply in the Far East, the islands of the Pacific, in Southern Africa, the Saar Valley, in Upper Adige, in German Austria,

and Bohemia, in portions of Istria, in vast stretches inhabited by the colored races, in Russia.

The President says: "The atmosphere in which the conference worked seemed created, not by the ambitions of strong governments, but by the hopes and aspirations of small nations and of peoples hitherto under bondage to the power that victory had shattered and destroyed." In light of the fact that the work in Paris was done by the five great Powers and of the further fact that the proposed League of Nations is to be controlled by nine nations dominated by the great five, this statement presents something of a quandary.

Again, the President comes to the defense of his most worthy principle of self-determination. He says: "It was the imperative task of those who would make peace, and make it intelligently, to establish a new order which would rest upon the free choice of peoples." Once again we wonder about the "free choice" in Shantung, and we also wonder how that statement squares with the President's remark a few lines later, in which he says laconically, "The German colonies were to be disposed of." It must be confessed that we find difficulty in putting our finger always on his "principles of justice or enlightened expediency." When the President tells us that the old policies mean nothing "else but force, force—always force," policies which he describes as "intolerable," one wonders how, being so opposed to the sanction of force, he can find so much solace in a new scheme for the control of the nations by force.

OFFICIAL RADIOS AS NEWS CARRIERS

WE HAVE heretofore pointed out the importance of a cheaper news service between the United States and the Far East. The need is now greater, because the misunderstandings and misrepresentations relative to the Orient are now more serious. We need the facts as never before. Japan, China, and the United States need a pitiless publicity, to the end that their international relations may not become more pitiful. The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce is alive to the situation. Pleading for better news service, and urging the use of Government radios for that purpose, it says: "Only through such a step can the people of the United States and the Far East keep in touch with each other, become familiar with public sentiment and conditions, and avoid misunderstandings which must result from ignorance and misrepresentation." It goes on, "Not more than one newspaper in China is in a position to pay a fair share of the cost of delivering a news service from the United States. At the present time news is disseminated only through Japanese and British sources, and it is only natural that news from this